



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/759,116 | 01/11/2001 | Ian Andrew Bell | EVC00-003 | 9875 |

22200 7590 08/14/2002

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
702 MARSHALL STREET
SUITE 310
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2645 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/759,116 | Applicant(s) BELL, IAN ANDREW |
| | Examiner Ming Chow | Art Unit 2645 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "close in time" cited in claim 15 needs to be specifically defined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 19, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Venturini (US-PAT-NO: 5,987,317).

For claims 1, 19, 31 regarding registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator, Venturini teaches on Column 2 Line 15 a network with which the user terminal is registered. Venturini also teaches on Column 3 Line 10 this notification is provided to the user via a message displayed on the display of the user terminal. The display of Venturini is the claimed indicator. Regarding receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user, Venturini teaches on Column 3 Line 6 in response to receiving the first signal the user terminal notifies the user that at least one message is stored in the voice mailbox. The first signal of Venturini is the claimed notification of receipt of a first communication". Regarding initiating a first wireless signal to said device wherein in response to said first signal said indicator activates to alert the user, Venturini teaches on Column 3 Line 4 the message station transmits a first signal. The "transmits a first signal" of Venturini is the claimed initiating a first wireless signal". Venturini teaches on Column 3 Line 6 in response to receiving the first signal the user terminal notifies the user that at least one message is stored in the voice mailbox. The "notifies the user" of Venturini is the claimed "alert the user".

Regarding claim 5, Venturini teaches on Column 10 Line 12 identifier tag information may be included in a registration message. The identifier tag of Venturini is the claimed identification code. Venturini also teaches on Column 10 Line 16 the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, "Work Office System". Venturini further teaches on Column 10 Line 31 the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, "Public System". The "Work Office System" and "Public System" of Venturini are the claimed "one or more types of communications".

Regarding Claim 6, Venturini teaches on Column 10 Line 26 stores the identifier tag information in the memory. The identifier tag information of Venturini is the claimed "identification code and said association". The memory (of mobile terminal) of Venturini is the claimed first server. Venturini also teaches on Column 10 Line 53 a menu function is entered which prompts the user to either specify an identifier tag for the public network voice mailbox or to indicate that the user does not wish to specify an identifier tag. The "user to enter" of Venturini is the claimed 'configuring'. Venturini further teaches on Column 2 Line 59 a user of the user terminal can be notified if there are messages stored in a voice mailbox. Venturini further teaches on Column 13 Line 11 the teaching of this invention may also be employed in other suitable types of communications system with the network having a memory storing the messages.

Regarding claim 8, Venturini teaches on Column 2 Line 59 a user of the user terminal can be notified if there are messages stored in a voice mailbox. The messages stored in a voice mailbox of Venturini is the claimed voice-mail message.

3. Claims 26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amin (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,307).

For claim 26, regarding receiving notification of a first communication for a first user, Amin teaches on Column 5 Line 29 the mobile switching center then receives the voice mail notification. Regarding accessing a user profile of the first user, said user profile identifying a set of communication waiting indication devices associated with the first user wherein each device

in said set of devices comprises an indicator, Amin teaches on Column 6 Line 65 a mobile station user's profile stored in the private base station can support additional features like 5. Telephone answering device/message support. The "Telephone answering device" of Amin is the claimed "communication waiting indication devices". It is inherent that the communication waiting indication devices must have an indicator. Regarding initiating a first wireless signal to said subset of devices wherein in response to said first wireless signal said indicators of said subset of devices are actuated, Amin teaches on Column 2 Line 49 this voice mail notification is forwarded to a mobile wireless device. Regarding identifying a subset of said communication waiting indication devices based on said first communication. Amin teaches on Column 8 Line 38 the user of a registered mobile station can have a distinctive ringing sound.

Regarding claim 30, Amin teaches on column 6 Line 65 a mobile station user's profile 2. distinctive alerting. The "distinctive alerting" of Amin is the claimed criteria.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2645

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini failed to teach initiating a second wireless signal to said device wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "turn off" of Neustein is the claimed "deactivate". It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed "second") wireless signal to the pager (claimed "device) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to initiate a second wireless signal to said device wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the second wireless signal for deactivating the indicator to the system users.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and Neustein as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini and Neustein failed to teach said second wireless signal is initiated after the user access said first communication. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "voice message" of Neustein is the claimed "first communication". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini and Neustein

Art Unit: 2645

to have said second wireless signal initiated after the user access said first communication as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the second wireless signal initiated after the user accesses said first communication to the system users.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini failed to teach said indicator deactivates in response to manipulation of the device by the user. However, Shull et al teach on Column 5 Line 66 a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator. The "activate the button" of Shull is the claimed manipulation. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have said indicator deactivates in response to manipulation of the device by the user as taught by Shull such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the manipulation to the system users.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Jyogataki et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,192,251). Venturini failed to teach storing said identification code and said association on a first server; receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria identifying when said first signal should be sent in response to receipt of a first type of communication; and configuring said first server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device when; it is determined that said first type of communication is received for the user; and said one or more criteria are

Art Unit: 2645

satisfied. However, Jyogataki et al teach on FIG. 4 PHS Terminal 1 and item S14 (Input State). The PHS Terminal PS1 of Jyogataki is the claimed “the user”. The “input state” of FIG. 1 of Jyogataki is the claimed “receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have storing said identification code and said association on a first server; receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria identifying when said first signal should be sent in response to receipt of a first type of communication; and configuring said first server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device when; it is determined that said first type of communication is received for the user; and said one or more criteria are satisfied as taught by Jyogataki et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria to the system users.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 5 above, and in view of LuPorta et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,918,158). Venturini failed to teach said first communication is an electronic mail message. However, LuPorta et al teach on Column 5 Line 18 an electronic mail to a computer. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have said first communication an electronic mail message as taught by LuPorta et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the electronic mail message to the system users.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Houggy et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226). Venturini

Art Unit: 2645

failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device. However, Houggy et al teach on Column 38 and Line 36 transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second devices at the same time. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device as taught by Houggy et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the initiating said first signal to said second device to the system users.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Homan et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,317,485). Venturini failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when notification of receipt of a second communication directed to the user is received, but not when said notification of said first communication is received. However, Homan et al teach on Column 8 Line 12 the message store provider provides the subscriber with a mechanism to identify which types of messages should trigger notification. The types of messages that do not trigger notification of Homan is the claimed “first communication”. The types of messages that do trigger notification of Homan is the claimed “second communication”. The notification of Homan is the claimed first signal. Homan et al also teach on Column 7 Line 11 additional sub-menu choices corresponding to the available notify choices: paging notify, outcall notify, e-mail notify, lamp notify, and stutter tone notify. The

device of receiving notifications of Homan is the claimed second message-indicating device. It is inherent that the second message-indicating device must be registered for receiving the notification. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when notification of receipt of a second communication directed to the user is received, but not when said notification of said first communication is received as taught by Homan et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the registering the second message-indication device, initiating first signal to second device to the system users.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Regarding receiving a communication directed to a user; initiating a first electronic signal to a first message-waiting device includes an indicator and said first electronic signal is configured to activate said indicator; providing said communication to said user; all rejections of claim 1 apply. Venturini failed to teach after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a “voice message” indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device) to turn off the indicator. It would have been

Art Unit: 2645

obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to initiate a second wireless signal to said device wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the second wireless signal for deactivating the indicator to the system users. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the second signal to deactivate said indicator to the system users.

12. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733). Regarding receiving a first wireless signal at a first message-indication device, activating said alarm in response to said first wireless signal, and deactivating, the rejections of claim 1 apply. Venturini failed to teach the alarm. However, Kyte teaches on Column 3 Line 5 a channel signal light corresponding to the pager visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have alarm as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the alarm to the system users.

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and Kyte as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini

Art Unit: 2645

and Kyte failed to teach deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to a second wireless signal. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "turn off" of Neustein is the claimed "deactivate". It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed "second") wireless signal to the pager (claimed "device) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini and Kyte to deactivate said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to a second wireless signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini/Kyte would be able to support the second wireless signal for deactivating the indicator to the system users.

14. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte/Neustein as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini/Kyte/Neustein failed to teach said second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "voice message" of Neustein is the claimed "first communication". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Kyte/Neustein to have said second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini/Kyte/Neustein

would be able to support the second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication to the system users.

15. Claim16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Shull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini/Kyte failed to teach deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to manipulation of the first device by the user. However, Shull et al teach on Column 5 Line 66 a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator. The “activate the button” of Shull is the claimed manipulation. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Kyte to have deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to manipulation of the first device by the user as taught by Shull such that the modified system of Venturini/Kyte would be able to support the manipulation to the system users.

16. Claim17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Venturini et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,987,317). Venturini/Kyte failed to teach comprising registering said first device for activativation in response to receipt of one of multiple types of communication including said first communication. However, Venturini teaches on Column 10 Line 12 identifier tag information may be included in a registration message. The identifier tag of Venturini is the claimed identification code. Venturini also teaches on Column 10 Line 16 the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, “Work Office System”. Venturini further teaches on

Column 10 Line 31 the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, "Public System". The "Work Office System" and "Public System" of Venturini are the claimed "one of multiple types of communications". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Kyte to have comprising registering said first device for activativation in response to receipt of one of multiple types of communication including said first communication as taught by Venturini such that the modified system of Venturini/Kyte would be able to support the registering said first device for activativation to the system users.

17. Claim18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte as applied to claim 17 above, and in view of Houggly et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226). Venturini/Kyte failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications; receving a first wireless signal by said second message-indicating device close in time to said receipt of said first wireless signal by said first wireless device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and activating said alarm of said second device in response to said first wireless signal. However, Houggly et al teach on Column 38 and Line 36 transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second devices at the same time. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Kyte to have registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications; receiving a first wireless signal by said second message-indicating device close in time to said receipt of said first wireless signal by said first wireless device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and activating said alarm of said second device in response to said first

Art Unit: 2645

wireless signal as taught by Houggly et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the activating said alarm of said second device to the system users.

18. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Regarding a signal receiver configured to receive a first wireless signal generated after receipt of a communication; and an indicator configured to activate in response to receipt of said first signal; all rejections of claim 1 apply. Venturini failed to teach said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a “voice message” indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have said indicator configured to deactivate in response to a second signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the said indicator configured to deactivate in response to a second signal to the system users.

19. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini/Neustein failed to teach said second signal is a wireless signal. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a “voice message”

indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "turn off" of Neustein is the claimed "deactivate". It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed "second") wireless signal to the pager (claimed "device") to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Neustein to have said second signal a wireless signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini/Neustein would be able to support the second wireless signal to the system users.

20. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and in view of Shull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini/Neustein failed to teach further comprising a switch configured to issue said second signal in response to user manipulation. However, Shull et al teach on Column 5 Line 66 a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator. The "activate the button" of Shull is the claimed manipulation. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Neustein to have further comprising a switch configured to issue said second signal in response to user manipulation as taught by Shull such that the modified system of Venturini/Neustein would be able to support the manipulation to the system users.

21. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein/Shull as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Shull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini/Neustein/Shull failed to teach said indicator comprises said

switch. However, Shull et al teach on Column 5 Line 66 a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator. The “button” of Shull is the claimed switch. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini/Neustein/Shull to have said indicator comprises said switch as taught by Shull such that the modified system of Venturini/Neustein/Shull would be able to support the manipulation to the system users.

22. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733). Venturini and Neustein failed to teach said indicator is a visual indicator. However, Kyte teaches on Column 5 Line 1 on a side of each receiver unit is a message indicator light for visually indicating when a message has been recorded. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini and Neustein to have said indicator is a visual indicator as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Venturini/Neustein would be able to support the visual indicator to the system users.

23. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733). Venturini and Neustein failed to teach said indicator is an audible indicator. However, Kyte teaches on Column 3 Line 8 an audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini and Neustein to have said indicator is an audible indicator as taught by Kyte such that the

Art Unit: 2645

modified system of Venturini/Neustein would be able to support the audible indicator to the system users.

24. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin as applied to claim 26 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Amin failed to teach initiating a second wireless signal to said subset of devices wherein in response to said second wireless signal and indicators of said subset of devices are de-actuated. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a “voice message” indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Amin to initiate a second wireless signal to said subset of devices wherein in response to said second wireless signal and indicators of said subset of devices are de-actuated as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Amin would be able to support the second wireless signal for de-actuating the indicator to the system users.

25. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and Neustein as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Amin and Neustein failed to teach said second wireless signal is initiated in response to acknowledgement of said first communication by said first user. However, Neustein teaches

on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "voice message" of Neustein is the claimed "first communication". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Amin and Neustein to have said second wireless signal initiated in response to acknowledgement of said first communication by said first user as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Amin/Neustein would be able to support the second wireless signal to the system users.

26. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin as applied to claim 26 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733). Amin failed to teach a first device in said subset of devices comprises a switch, the method further comprising: de-actuating said indicator of said first device in response to manipulation of said switch. However, Kyte teaches on Column 5 Line 7 the transmitter and receiver units are selectively activated using a power switch and each are powered with a battery means. It is inherent that the indicator must deactivate in response to manipulation (power switch off or removal of batteries) of the device by the user. Kyte further teaches on Column 4 Line 29 apparent to those skilled in the art, any number of light means, switches and buttons may be provided without departing from the spirit of the present invention. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Amin to have a first device in said subset of devices comprises a switch, the method further comprising: de-actuating said indicator of said first device in response to

manipulation of said switch as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Amin would be able to support the switch and manipulation to the system users.

27. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin as applied to claim 26 above, and in view of Amin (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,307). Amin failed to teach said user profile reflects user-specifiable criteria for determining when an indicator of a device in said set of devices is to be actuated in response to a communication received for the first user.

However, Amin teaches on column 6 Line 65 a mobile station user's profile 2. distinctive alerting. The "distinctive alerting" of Amin is the claimed criteria. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Amin to have user profile reflect user-specifiable criteria for determining when an indicator of a device in said set of devices is to be actuated in response to a communication received for the first user as taught by Amin such that the modified system of Amin would be able to support the user-specifiable criteria to the system users.

28. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733) and further in view of Jyogataki et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,192,251). Venturini failed to teach said first user profile is configured to identify one or more types of communication including said first communication in response to which said first wireless signal is to be initiated toward said first device. However, Kyte teaches on Column 2 Line 20 each discrete frequency transmission signal will communicate with a separate child pager/receiver device. The "discrete frequency transmission

signal" is the claimed "identification code". The "discrete frequency transmission signal" must be unique in order to separate the communicating pagers/receivers device. The "communicate with a separate child pager/receiver device" of Kyte is the claimed "one or more types of communications". Each type of communication (communicate with a separate pager/receiver of Kyte) must be associated with its identification code. Venturini failed to teach a first server configured to store said identification code in association with a first user profile for the first user. However, Jyogataki et al teach on FIG. 5 and Column 5 Line 19 the recall data includes a caller number for identifying the terminal the other party ID for identifying the other party, state designation information for designating the state of the other party to be notified in the recall. The "caller number for identifying the terminal" of Jyogataki et al is the claimed identification. The "state designation information" of Jyogataki et al is the claimed "association". The FIG. 5 shows the server where the "caller number for identifying the terminal" and "state designation information" of Jyogataki are stored. The item S40 of FIG. 5 of Jyogataki shows the server is configured to initiate said first wireless signal (recall PHS terminal PS1 of Jyogataki). It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have first user profile is configured to identify one or more types of communication including said first communication in response to which said first wireless signal is to be initiated toward said first device as taught by Kyte and a first server configured to store said identification code in association with a first user profile for the first user as taught by Jyogataki et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the server and user profile to the system users.

29. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733) and further in view of Houggy et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226). Venturini failed to teach said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal. However, Kyte teaches on Column 3 Line 5 a channel signal light corresponding to the pager visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit. Venturini failed to teach a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm. However, Houggy et al teach on Column 38 and Line 36 transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second devices at the same time. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal as taught by Kyte and a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm as taught by Houggy et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal and a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm to the system users.

30. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733) and further in view of Homan et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,317,485). Venturini failed to teach a second message waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm.

However, Kyte teaches on Column 3 Line 5 a channel signal light corresponding to the pager Visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit. Venturini failed to teach said alarm of said second device is not activated in response to said first wireless signal. However, Homan et al teach on Column 8 Line 12 the message store provider provides the subscriber with a mechanism to identify which types of messages should trigger notification. The notification triggered by the types of messages of Homan is the claimed "first wireless signal". The alarm of device (claimed second device) of which receives messages that do not trigger the notification is not activated. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the second device comprising an alarm and the alarm is not activated in response to said first wireless signal as taught by Kyte and Homan et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the alarm and not activated by first signal to the system users.

31. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini failed to teach said notification server initiates a second wireless signal toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication; and wherein in response to said second wireless signal said alarm is deactivated. However, Neustein teaches on Column 14 Line 10 this feature automatically sets a "voice message" indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The "turn off" of Neustein is the claimed "deactivate". It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed "second") wireless signal to the pager (claimed

“device) to turn off the indicator. The “voice message” of Neustein is the claimed “first communication”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have notification server initiates a second wireless signal toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication; and wherein in response to said second wireless signal said alarm is deactivated as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the second wireless signal initiated toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication to the system users.

Conclusion

32. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Rochkind et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,875,401) teaches method and apparatus for initiating wireless messages.

33. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

Art Unit: 2645

proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service Fax Number 703-872-9314.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit2645

Ming Chow

(W)

**FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

